REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 28, 2011. Claims 1-17 currently stand rejected. As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken individually or in any proper combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims to clarify aspects of the claims. No new matter has been added by the amendment. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the present application.

A. Claims 1, 5, 13, and 15 are Novel.

Claims 1, 5, 13, and 15 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,802,590 to Draves. However, Draves fails to anticipate the claims because Draves does not teach each and every feature of the claims.

Independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 13 and 15 recite "inhibiting further access by the first process to the resource after use of the resource by the first process, arising from the allocation of the handle, has been terminated, and permitting further access to the resource by the second process." In this regard, the independent claims indicate that the first process is inhibited or prevented from re-using the handle to access the resource after having already used the handle to access the resource for the original purpose. Subsequently, the second process, to which the resource was first allocated, is permitted to further access the resource. This concept is described in the specification at least at paragraphs [0020]-[0026] and [0055]. Draves fails to teach or suggest these features of the claims.

Draves describes an operating system that relies upon handle/key pairs and a system-wide resource table to establish security between processes and resources. To generate a handle/key pair, an Allocation Resource Routine creates a randomly-generated key. Draves Col. 4, Lines 64-66. The key is then used to determine a handle via a hashing function. The handle is used as an index in the resource table. Draves Col. 5, Lines 13-15. This handle/key pair is then furnished to a process (a client process) for use to access a related resource. Draves Col. 5, Lines 32-36. When it is necessary to access the resource, the process passes the handle/key pair to the

kernel and the kernel verifies the key and the handle against the resource table to ensure that the process has authorization to access the resource. Draves Col. 5, Lines 37-61. The kernel then grants or denies access based on the comparison to the resource table. Draves Col. 5, Lines 37-61. As described by Draves, one important aspect is the ability to re-use the handle for future accessing of the resource without the need to re-generate the handle using the hashing function. Draves Col. 5, Lines 58-61.

Having described the functionality described in Draves generally, the question turns to whether Draves discloses "inhibiting further access by the first process to the resource after use of the resource by the first process, arising from the allocation of the handle, has been terminated, and permitting further access to the resource by the second process" as recited in the claims. In support of the standing rejection, the Office Action cites to a portion of Draves that describes resource deallocation. In this regard, Col. 5, Line 62 to Col. 6, Line 2 describes the operations performed to deallocate a resource that is no longer needed and therefore the resource can be released. This portion of Draves appears to bear no relationship to the inhibiting of a process to re-access a resource after having already used the resource and permitting further use of the resource by a another process to which the resource had originally been allocated. Draves is not describing the subsequent restriction on the process to access an existing resource, but is rather merely describing the releasing, and therefore elimination, of the resource. Since the resource is eliminated, Draves cannot permit the resource to be accessed by another process to which the resource is allocated. As such, the concept of inhibiting one process while permitting another is clearly different than simply eliminating the resource as provided in Draves.

The Office Action also cites to Col. 5, Lines 50-51 for teaching or suggesting this *inhibiting one process while permitting another process* feature recited in the claims. However, this portion of Draves merely describes the authorization process that is performed by the kernel when access to the resource is requested via a handle/key pair as described above. Nothing in this portion of Draves indicates that subsequent attempts to access the resource are being considered, either with respect to inhibiting the ability to access the resource or permitting the resource to be accessed. Only the handle/key pair is used for authorization in Draves.

Not only does Draves fail to describe anything akin to this subsequent inhibiting feature of the claims, it appears that Draves touts the advantages of subsequent reuse of the handle/key

pair in clear contradiction to the content of the claims. As mentioned above, use of the handle/key pair allegedly avoids the need to engage in the processing overhead of using a hashing function to repeatedly create a handle, by simply reusing the handle. There is nothing in Draves that describes a limitation on the reuse of the handle, particularly since one of the goals of Draves is to avoid the need to regenerate the handle and the processing needed to do so.

Moreover, in the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action clarifies its position with respect to the inhibiting feature of the claims. On page 11, the Office Action states that its reliance on Draves is based on the interpretation that the "revocation [of access] is accomplished by deletion of the resource" as provided in Draves. In other words, the Office Action is taking the position that deletion of the resource is a form of inhibiting, and rejecting the claims based on this interpretation. However, in view of the amended claims, it is clear that the resource is not deleted, but is still accessible to another process. As such, this formulates a clear distinction between the deletion technique provided in Draves and the *inhibiting one process while permitting another process* technique recited in the claims.

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, Draves fails to teach or suggest the feature of inhibiting access to one process while permitting access by another as recited in the claims. Draves therefore fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 13, and 15, and their respective dependent claims, and the rejection of claims 1, 5, 13 and 15 is overcome.

B. Claims 2-4, 6-12, and 14-17 are Nonobvious.

Claims 2-4, 6-12, and 14-17 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draves in various combinations with Applicant Admitted Prior Art, U.S. Patent No. 6,601,102 to Eldridge, U.S. Patent No. 6,971,017 to Stringer, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200436 to Eun, and U.S. Patent No. 6,934,757 to Kalantar. However, the cited combination relies upon Draves for disclosing the same features as described above with respect to the anticipation rejection. Since Draves fails in this regard, and the other cited references do not cure the deficiencies of Draves (nor are they cited for this purpose), dependent claims 2-4, 6-12, and 14-17 are patentable over the cited combination due at least to the failures of Draves. The rejections of claims 2-4, 6-12, and 14-17 are therefore overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/595,927
Amdt. dated 09/22/2011
Reply to Office action of 03/28/2011

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit
that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of
Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the
present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in
order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required,
beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper.
However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of
this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required
therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit
Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathaniel T. Quirk
Registration No. 60,676

Customer No. 10949
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT &
TRADEMARK OFFICE ON **Setember 22, 2011.**